

26 March 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

THROUGH : Chief, Functional Training Division

SUBJECT : Course Report - The Intelligence Production Course (2-75)

1. Introductory Comments

The 24-day Intelligence Production Course (2-75) ended on 14 March with closing comments by the Director of Training. The last week of the program concluded on a particularly successful note when Dr. Proctor spent over 90 minutes in a candid question/answer session with the students. He told us earlier of his eagerness to meet with the group and afterward remarked that he was impressed with the questions he received.

The five-week program was an overall success in terms of what was set to be accomplished and the quality of Agency and non-Agency participation. Some problems were encountered, most of them developing despite careful course planning. These are discussed later in this report and in the student critiques.

Although this class was rather quiet and reserved as compared with previous classes, there were a few outstanding individuals among both the Career Trainees and the others. Student response to the course requirements was satisfactory in every respect.

Course objectives and methodology are outlined in the attached syllabus.

2. Class Composition

Sixteen students were enrolled in this course, most of them young professionals who had been with the Agency only a few years. They represented eight components from all four Directorates, as follows:

STATSPEC

DDI - OCI, CRS, [REDACTED]
DDS&T - OSI, OWI, NPIC
DDO - Africa Division
DDA - OTR

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/05/15 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100100001-9

Seven were current CTs, six of whom were destined for assignments in the DDI and one in the DDA. All students were college graduates, seven had masters degrees and two had PhDs. Grades ranged from GS-8 to GS-13. There was an unusually wide range in their ages (23 to 50) and length of Agency experience (6 months to 20 years). This wide variety of students and interests produced some minor problems, discussed below in Section 4. One student, a CT, was withdrawn for administrative reasons after the second week of the course, but he is expected to attend the last portion of the next IPC.

3. Changes and Innovations

a. Course length: Some minor adjustments were made in scheduling to reduce course length to five weeks; the previous running was five and a half weeks, and the one before that was seven weeks. Reasons for this reduction are two-fold: to test the impact of five weeks on course objectives in preparation for the FY 1976 training cycle for CTs, and to shorten the course to accommodate those components of the DDI and DDS&T that would prefer a shorter course because of resource problems that are created during an analyst's absence for training.

b. Official visits: We requested and received changes in format and speakers for visits made to DIA, NSA, and several production offices within the Agency. Most of these were an improvement over our last two runnings but we still have a serious problem involving our State Department visit which we will work on prior to the next course. The Department of Defense briefings and tours with one exception were not as good as last fall but we have a plan in mind that will overcome these deficiencies.

c. New curriculum inputs: We added a special panel on Collection Guidance this time and with some schedule adjustments to allow for more extended discussion this should prove to be very worthwhile for future classes. We also added some new reading material, study guides and two films. [REDACTED] shortened his segment on the Intercultural and Psychological Dimension in Analysis and included a panel discussion.

25X1A

Approved For Release 2000/05/15 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100100001-9

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/05/15 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100100001-9

4. Problems Encountered and Plans to Resolve Them

Repetition within the course and overlap with other courses were the most serious problems noted by students and course staff alike. Many lectures which now are offered in other training courses -- most notably the IWA -- will not be given in the next running of the IPC because of the changed format for FY 1976. This should partly satisfy those students who complained of repetition -- especially the CTs who completed the IWA course just months ago. In the fall, the IPC will assume that the CT new one-week orientation is sufficient and will build on that but offer no further introductory material.

This new format of course will not satisfy the non-CTs, but we can overcome that problem through assigned readings and small group discussions. Their Agency experience in this class ranged from 6 months to 20 years. Some had previous OTR training; others had not. If repeated in the next class, some may be bored or complain that the lectures are too shallow, while others will take an opposite view. In the future, non-CT applicants will be screened more carefully to see that this course would be fully appropriate to their needs and background.

We still have a problem of getting guest lecturers to talk on the topics that we request and eliminating bad speakers without offending them or their offices. Some lectures and visits were unquestionably poor. The visit to State Department, for example, was acknowledged by students and staff alike to be a low point in the course. (Conversations with others in OTR reveal that State Department gives a notoriously bad performance for all courses. Yet we cannot omit State as a collection agency.) Often despite our efforts to guide the speaker's topics, some fell back to the relative safety of canned presentations.

Student praise of the contact and rapport they have with working analysts has prompted us to look more toward youth. One of our best presentations, for example, was from an OCI analyst just four years with the Agency. In future classes we hope to seek out more young briefers and rework more office visits (OCI in particular) to schedule sessions with analysts, emphasizing case studies.

We discovered only after our schedule was arranged that Agency busses were not available for transporting us between 1130 and 1300. This caused considerable last minute revision of our schedule and left us occasionally with more time at an office than we really wanted. We do not know how this will effect our schedule for the next class.

Approved For Release 2000/05/15 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100100001-9

5. Student Reaction

In general, the students were polite, receptive and cooperative throughout the five weeks. Most felt that the course was interesting, met their needs and objectives, and better prepared them to function as intelligence analysts when they returned to their jobs. A few who were initially dubious about the course admitted at the conclusion that the course was "better than I expected it to be." There were two notable exceptions -- one CT and one non-CT -- who apparently were looking for a "how to" course and stated unequivocally that the course missed the mark for them.

Two critique forms were given to the students, one following the second week and one at the end of the course. (These accompany this report.) Additionally, the course administrators had several informal discussions about the course content with some members of the class which in many ways were more valuable than the formal written exercise.

Students overwhelmingly felt that the course contained too much introductory material and too much repetition, especially during the first two weeks. They singled out for criticism much of the material outlining the intelligence community and the role of CIA in relation to other agencies which they noted was repetitive within the course and also overlapped considerably with similar presentations in the IWA course. Some also suggested that the course contained too much emphasis on collection at the expense of analysis and production. Many of these problems will be eliminated with the changed format of the IPC in the FY 1976 program which is now being planned.

good

They also overwhelmingly agreed that one of the real values of the course was the opportunity to talk with working analysts. This was done principally in two ways. On some trips to other government agencies, the students were given an introductory briefing and then taken individually or in small groups to the analyst's desk to talk over specific topics or problems and exchange views. Visits to production offices within CIA often took the format of analysts presenting a series of "case studies" typical of the work or problems that the office handles. With few exceptions, these were extremely well done. In fact, many of the students suggested that the "junior" analysts were better speakers and offered more pertinent briefings than the "senior" speakers or office chiefs who often delivered "canned" lectures which were not specifically geared to the objectives of this course.

Several of the students noted that the time allotted for familiarization to certain aspects of information science was not sufficient and that it should be eliminated, reduced to one lecture (which would, in essence, outline the information science courses available in OTR), or expanded to allow time to teach something worthwhile. This shortcoming will also be corrected in the FY 1976 program for the IPC.

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/05/15 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100100001-9

6. Concluding Remarks

IPC 2-75 was probably the last course for analyst development where the larger percentage of the class was direct-hire professionals. Beginning with the September running, we anticipate classes of about 20 officers of which 12-15 or more will be CTs.

This last course was a much smoother operation than previously because two staff members conducted the course. As a team they served the students better than was possible in the past -- particularly in the counseling and informal discussions we were able to have with them which was difficult when only one person ran the course.

We were pleased that all four Directorates had representatives in the course and we were particularly appreciative of the effort of [REDACTED] DDO Training Officer, in again designating a DDO officer for attendance. We feel that a carefully selected DDO professional adds depth to a course where many of the other students tend to look at the Operations Directorate in a rather narrow sense.

25X1A

Attachments:

- A. Course Syllabus (annotated)
- B. Class Roster
- C. Student Critiques

Approved For Release 2000/05/15 : CIA-RDP80-00503A000100100001-9

CONFIDENTIAL